



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,595	08/17/2007	David Minodier	F40.12-0122	7469
27367 7590 01/26/2012 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A. SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER JOHN, CLARENCE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2443				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/26/2012		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/598,595

**Applicant(s)**

MINODIER ET AL.

**Examiner**

CLARENCE JOHN

**Art Unit**

2443

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2012.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-800)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/6/2012 has been entered.

### ***Status of Claims***

This action is responsive to a RCE filed on January 6, 2012. Claims 1-13, 15 and 16 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Though there are no arguments presented by the Applicant on the remarks filed on 1/6/2012, the Applicant has stated that the Amendments currently filed are in response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 6, 2011 and the Applicant's previous response filed on December 6, 2011.
2. **In reply**, the Examiner states that the Applicant's arguments filed on December 6, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and do not place the Application in condition for allowance. **The Examiner maintains the same**

**view and response as presented in the previous Advisory Action filed on December 14, 2011.**

3. With respect to Claim 1 of the Final rejection filed on 7/6/2011, the Examiner indicated that certain features on which the Applicant relies, i.e., "transmitting to the client an authentication for accessing the virtual network, are not recited in the rejected claims".
4. In the Remarks filed on 12/6/2011, the Applicant commented on Page 9 - first paragraph that "transmitting to the client an authentication for accessing the virtual network, are not recited in the rejected claims". "Specifically, the Examiner indicates that, transmitting information to the client is not claimed".
5. **In reply**, the Examiner did not state, "transmitting information to the client is not claimed". Instead, the Examiner emphasized that, "an authentication for accessing the virtual network" are not recited in the rejected claims. The Applicant pointed out, "said client being able to access services of at least one service provider via the at least one virtual network" is recited in Claim 1. This limitation clearly shows that the client is able to access services of at least one service provider but "an authentication for accessing the virtual network" is **not** recited anywhere in the rejected claims. The currently amended limitation recites, "wherein at least one subscription system, including an address server, is

connected to an authentication network which is different from the or each virtual network, said at least one subscription system allowing said client to subscribe to said at least one service provider, via the authentication network. This limitation shows that the authentication network is different from the virtual network.

6. With respect to Claim 1, the Applicant also argues that Grobman does not teach transferring information which makes it possible to make the protocol of the client compatible with the access control protocol.
7. **In reply**, the Examiner disagrees and states that Grobman does teach the above limitation. Grobman teaches a system for authenticating an outside client to access the services of a system. Grobman also teaches authenticating a client to access services when software and predetermined access control protocol are not compatible. (Page 1, paragraph [0013], Page 2 – paragraph [0019]. Here the application operates to convert or transcode between authentication systems in order to allow a new incompatible protocol and forward or transfer the credentials in order to be authenticated. After the application 108 provides the security credentials 204, the application forwards the credentials 206 to an authentication front-end 110. The application may alter or change the credentials before forwarding them according to the new incompatible protocol, which makes it possible to make the software of the client compatible with the access control protocol).

8. With respect to Claim 1, the Applicant also argues that Kelley does not teach an address server transmits to the client an address for accessing at least one subscription system and upon detection of the subscription of the client said at least one subscription system transfers to the client.
9. **In reply**, the Examiner states that Kelley does teach the above limitation. Kelley teaches a method and apparatus for broadcast services, transmission and reception for a client in a subscription system and authenticating the client to access the services. Kelley also teaches a network comprising an address server (Page 1 – paragraph [0014], Figure 6 – Content Server, Page 3 – paragraph [0045] lines 1-4); and at least one subscription system (Page 1 – paragraph [0023], paragraph [0026], [paragraph [0027], Page 10 – paragraph [0104], Figure 15 and Figure 18. Here, System 1400 is the Subscription system); for allowing said client to subscribe to said at least one service provider (Page 2 – paragraph [0038] lines 11-20, Page 2 – paragraph [0052], Page 5 – paragraph [0057], paragraph [0059] lines 8-16. Here the Registration Key serves as a security association between the user and the content server who has subscribed to the service. The User Identification Module UIM 208 includes stored information including URL address information); upon detection of the subscription of the client said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider; (Page 3 – paragraph [0043], Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-

18, paragraph [0059] lines 8-16, Page 9 – paragraph [0098]. Here, the subscribed users have controlled access to HSBS service after the users registers for the subscription services and receives subscription keys, the user is authenticated to use the services of the service provider. The content server provides the Broadcast Access Key BAK to the user to view and access the services).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinstein et al (US 2002/0191572) in view of Kelley et al. (US 2005/0129231) in further view of Grobman (US 2004/0093519).
11. With respect to Claim 1, Weinstein teaches a method of authenticating a telecommunication terminal called a client for access to at least one virtual network, (Figure 9, Page 3, paragraph [0021] lines 1-18, Page 6, paragraph [0069] lines 1-9); said client comprising software (Page 2 – paragraph [0020] lines 1-7); and when said software and predetermined access control protocol for access to said at least one virtual network are compatible (Page 3 – paragraph

[0030], Figure 7, paragraph [0035]); said client being able to access services of at least one service provider via the at least one virtual network the or each virtual network being set up on a telecommunications network (Page 3 – paragraph [0031], Figure 8A, Figure 8B, Page 4 – paragraph [0042] lines 1-7); said authentication network which is different from the or each virtual network (Page 4 – paragraph [0042] lines 16-21).

12. Weinstein teaches the limitations of Claim 1 as stated above. However, Weinstein does not explicitly state wherein at least one subscription system including an address server for allowing said client to subscribe to said at least one service provider, said address server transmits to the client an address for accessing said at least one subscription system; upon reception of said address, the client accesses said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider; upon detection of the subscription of the client, said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider ; upon detection of the subscription of the client said at least one subscription system transfers to the client.
13. Conversely, Kelley teaches the above limitation. Kelley teaches a method and apparatus for broadcast services, transmission and reception for a client in a subscription system and authenticating the client to access the services. Kelley also teaches one subscription system (Page 1 – paragraph [0023], paragraph [0026], [paragraph [0027], Page 10 – paragraph [0104], Figure 15 and Figure



18); including an address server (Page 1 – paragraph [0014], Figure 6 – Content Server, Page 3 – paragraph [0045] lines 1-4); for allowing said client to subscribe to said at least one service provider (Page 2 – paragraph [0038] lines 11-20, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18); upon reception of said address the client accesses said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider (Page 2 – paragraph [0033], Page 4 – paragraph [0050] lines 21-24, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18); upon detection of the subscription of the client said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider ; (Page 3 – paragraph [0043] lines 1-3, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18, paragraph [0059] lines 8-16. Here, once the users registers for the subscription services, the user is authenticated to use the services of the service provider).

14. Weinstein and Kelley have common grounds of client server communication in accessing and exchanging data resources. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Kelley with Weinstein by implementing a subscription system where clients can be authenticated to access services from a service provider by means of an encryption key in order to maintain security and unique identification.

15. Weinstein and Kelley teach the limitations of Claim 1 as stated above. Kelley also teaches detection of the subscription of the client, said at least one subscription system transfers to the client. (Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 18-29).
16. However, Weinstein and Kelley do not explicitly state about when software and predetermined access control protocol are not compatible, the method comprises the following elements: an authentication for accessing services to which the client has subscribed; and information which makes it possible to make the software of the client compatible with the predetermined access control protocol.
17. Conversely, Grobman teaches the above limitations. Grobman teaches a system for authenticating a outside client to access the services of a system. Grobman also teaches authenticating a client to access services when software and predetermined access control protocol are not compatible. (Page 1, paragraph [0013], Page 2 – paragraph [0019]. Here the application operates to convert or transcode between authentication systems in order to allow a new incompatible protocol and forward he credentials in order to be authenticated. The application may alter or change the credentials before forwarding them according to the new incompatible protocol, which makes it possible to make the software of the client compatible with the access control protocol).
18. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access

protocols and software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Grobman with Weinstein by implementing a system where the client with incompatible protocol is authenticated internally after verifying security credentials even before accessing the external system.

19. With respect to Claim 2, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman teach a method according to Claim 1 wherein the authentication network is a virtual network or a network that is separate from the telecommunication network. (Weinstein's teachings on Page 5, paragraph [0055] and [0056]. Figure 3A. Here the virtual operator network is different from mobile network).
20. With respect to Claim 11, Weinstein teaches a system for authenticating a telecommunication terminal called client for access to at least one virtual network, (Figure 9, Page 3, paragraph [0021] lines 1-18, Page 6, paragraph [0069] lines 1-9); said client comprising software (Page 2 – paragraph [0020] lines 1-7); and when said software and predetermined access control protocol for access to said at least one virtual network are compatible (Page 3 – paragraph [0030], Figure 7, paragraph [0035]); said client being able to access services of at least one service provider via the at least one virtual network (Page 3 – paragraph [0031], Figure 8A, Figure 8B, Page 4 – paragraph [0042] lines 1-7). the or each virtual network being set up on a telecommunication network (Page 2

– paragraph [0017]), the system comprising: an authentication network set up on a said telecommunication network; (Page 2 – paragraph [0017]); said authentication network being different from the at least one virtual network (Page 4 – paragraph [0042] lines 16-21).

21. Weinstein teaches the limitations of Claim 11 as stated above. However, Weinstein does not explicitly state about an address server connected to the authentication network, said at least one subscription system allowing said client to subscribe to said at least one service provider via the authentication network wherein the address server is configured to allow said client to subscribe to said at least one service provider via the authentication network and subscription system is arranged to detect the subscription of the client and transfer to said client.

22. Conversely, Kelley teaches the above limitation. Kelley teaches a method and apparatus for broadcast services, transmission and reception for a client in a subscription system and authenticating the client to access the services. Kelley also teaches an address server connected to the authentication network (Page 1 – paragraph [0014], Figure 6 – Content Server, Page 3 – paragraph [0045] lines 1-4); and at least one subscription system (Page 1 – paragraph [0023], paragraph [0026], paragraph [0027], Page 10 – paragraph [0104], Figure 15 and Figure 18); said at least one subscription system allowing said client to subscribe to said at least one service provider via the authentication network (Page 2 – paragraph [0038] lines 11-20, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18);

the client is arranged to receive said address accesses said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider; (Page 2 – paragraph [0033], Page 4 – paragraph [0050] lines 21-24, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18); upon detection of the subscription of the client said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider ; (Page 3 – paragraph [0043] lines 1-3, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18, paragraph [0059] lines 8-16. Here, once the users registers for the subscription services, the user is authenticated to use the services of the service provider).

23. Weinstein and Kelley have common grounds of client server communication in accessing and exchanging data resources. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Kelley with Weinstein by implementing a subscription system where clients can be authenticated to access services from a service provider by means of an encryption key in order to maintain security and unique identification.

24. Weinstein and Kelley teach the limitations of Claim 11 as stated above. Kelley also teaches detection of the subscription of the client, said at least one subscription system transfers to the client. (Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 18-29). However, Weinstein and Kelley do not explicitly state about when software

and predetermined access control protocol are not compatible, the method comprises an authentication for accessing services to which the client has subscribed; and information which makes it possible to make the software of the client compatible with the predetermined access control protocol.

25. Conversely, Grobman teaches the above limitations. Grobman teaches a system for authenticating a outside client to access the services of a system. Grobman also teaches authenticating a client to access services when software and predetermined access control protocol are not compatible. (Page 1, paragraph [0013], Page 2 – paragraph [0019]. Here the application operates to convert or transcode between authentication systems in order to allow a new incompatible protocol and forward he credentials in order to be authenticated. The application may alter or change the credentials before forwarding them according to the new incompatible protocol, which makes it possible to make the software of the client compatible with the access control protocol).

26. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols and software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Grobman with Weinstein by implementing a system where the client with incompatible protocol is authenticated internally after verifying security credentials even before accessing the external system.

27. Claims 3-9, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman in further view of Prasad et al. (US 7,197,125).
28. With respect to Claim 3, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman teach the limitations of Claim 1 as described above. However, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman do not explicitly state wherein the subscription system includes of at least one subscription portal, (Figure 1, block 104) an authentication material server (Figure 1, block 106) and, where-in response to the client subscribing subscribes to a service, (Figure 2A, block 2-009); the subscription portal transfers to an authentication server data associated with the authentication transferred to the client. (Figure 2A - blocks 2-001 to 2-004 and Figure 2B - block 2-015).
29. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches in the subscription system which includes of at least one subscription portal, (Figure 1, block 104) an authentication material server (Figure 1, block 106) and, where-in response to the client subscribing subscribes to a service, (Figure 2A, block 2-009); the subscription portal transfers to an authentication server data associated

with the authentication transferred to the client. (Figure 2A - blocks 2-001 to 2-004 and Figure 2B - block 2-015).

30. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.
31. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman by implementing an improved service selection and management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.
32. With respect to Claim 4, Weinstein, Kelley, Grobman and Prasad teach the limitations of Claim 3 as described above. However, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman do not explicitly state wherein the client is connected to the network via a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor performing the steps of obtaining an identifier and a client authentication confirmation from the authentication server.
33. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches wherein the client is connected to the network via a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor (Column 18, lines 24-29, Figure 7- block 718) and, if the client is compatible with the predetermined access control protocol the Digital Subscriber



Line Access Multiplexer performs the steps of obtaining an identifier and a client authentication material (Column 17, lines 5-11, Column 8, lines 49-55. Figure 2A block 2006. Here the command selections to the processor include the steps of obtaining a username and authentication quality) and of obtaining a client authentication confirmation from the authentication server (Column 8, lines 11-17 and Figure 2A, blocks 2-003 and 2-004).

34. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.
35. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman by implementing an improved service selection and management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.
36. With respect to Claim 5, Weinstein, Kelley, Grobman and Prasad teach the limitations of Claim 4 as described above. However, Weinstein, Grobman and Prasad do not explicitly state if the authentication server does not confirm the authentication of the client, the method comprises a step of authorizing data transfer between the client and at least one subscription system which allows the client to access the services of the or each service provider.

37. Conversely, Kelley teaches the above limitation. Kelley teaches a method and apparatus for broadcast services, transmission and reception for a client in a subscription system and authenticating the client to access the services. Kelley also teaches authorizing data transfer between the client and at least one subscription system (Page 1 – paragraph [0023], paragraph [0026], [paragraph [0027], Page 10 – paragraph [0104], Figure 15 and Figure 18); which allows the client to access the services of the or each service provider (Page 2 – paragraph [0033], Page 4 – paragraph [0050] lines 21-24, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18).
38. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication in accessing and exchanging data resources. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Kelley with Weinstein, Grobman and Prasad by implementing a subscription system where clients can be authenticated to access services from a service provider by means of an encryption key in order to maintain security and unique identification.
39. With respect to Claim 6, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman teach the limitations of Claim 3 as described above. However, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman do not explicitly state a method according to Claim 3, wherein there is a transfer to the authentication server of information associated with the service provider to which

the client is subscribed and/or information characterizing the service to which the client is subscribed.

40. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches about a transfer to the authentication server of information associated with the service provider to which the client is subscribed and/or information characterizing the service to which the client is subscribed. (Prasad - Column 10, lines 4 – 29, Fig 2B - blocks 2-014 through 2-017. This shows the information to which the client is subscribed).
41. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.
42. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman by implementing an improved service selection and management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.

43. With respect to Claim 7, Weinstein, Kelley, Grobman, and Prasad teach the limitations of Claim 6 as described above. However, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman do not explicitly state wherein the authentication server additionally transfers to the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer the information, associated with the service provider to which the client is a client and/or the information relating to the service or services to which the client is subscribed.
44. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches about an authentication server additionally transfers to the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer the information, associated with the service provider to which the client is a client and/or the information relating to the service or services to which the client is subscribed. (Prasad's teachings on Figure 2A blocks 2-006 through 2-011 and Figure 2B blocks 2-012 through 2-017 and Figure 4A blocks 4-007 through 4-009. Here the authentication server transfers all information to the service provider to which the client is subscribed).
45. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

46. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman by implementing an improved service selection and management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.
47. With respect to Claim 8, Weinstein, Kelley, Grobman and Prasad teach the limitations of Claim 7 as described above. However, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman do not explicitly state about the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer authorizes data transfer between the virtual network which allows the client to access the services of the service provider.
48. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer authorizes data transfer between the virtual network which allows the client to access the services of the service provider. (Prasad's teachings on Figure 4A, blocks 4-004 and 4-011. Here the client's data is transferred to the service provider for the client to access the services to which the client is subscribed according to the communication speeds to which the client is subscribed).

49. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.
50. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman by implementing an improved service selection and management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.
51. With respect to Claim 9, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman teach the limitations of Claim 1 as described above. However, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman do not explicitly state wherein an address server is also associated with the virtual authentication network.
52. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches wherein an address server is also associated with the virtual authentication network. (Column 19, lines 60-61, Column 20,, lines 31-34); and the address server allocates an address to the client for data transfer on the virtual authentication network. (Column 7, lines 16-18).

53. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.
54. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman by implementing an improved service selection and management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.
55. With respect to Claim 12, Weinstein teaches a method of authenticating a telecommunication terminal called client for access to at least one virtual network, (Figure 9, Page 3, paragraph [0021] lines 1-18, Page 6, paragraph [0069] lines 1-9); the or each virtual network being set up on a telecommunication network; wherein an authentication network is set up on said telecommunication network, (Page 2 – paragraph [0017]); said authentication network being different from the or each virtual network (Page 4 – paragraph [0042] lines 16-21); said client comprising software (Page 2 – paragraph [0020] lines 1-7); and when said software and predetermined access control protocol for access to said at least one virtual network are compatible (Page 3 – paragraph [0030], Figure 7, paragraph [0035]); said client being able to access services of at least one service provider via the at least one virtual network (Page 3 –

paragraph [0031], Figure 8A, Figure 8B, Page 4 – paragraph [0042] lines 1-7); wherein an authentication network is set up on said telecommunication network, (Page 2 – paragraph [0017]); said authentication network being different from the at least one virtual network (Page 4 – paragraph [0042] lines 16-21).

56. Weinstein teaches the limitations of Claim 12 as stated above. However, Weinstein does not explicitly state wherein at least one subscription system including an address server for allowing said client to subscribe to said at least one service provider, said address server transmits to the client an address for accessing said at least one subscription system; upon reception of said address, the client accesses said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider; upon detection of the subscription of the client, said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider ; upon detection of the subscription of the client said at least one subscription system transfers to the client.

57. Conversely, Kelley teaches the above limitation. Kelley teaches a method and apparatus for broadcast services, transmission and reception for a client in a subscription system and authenticating the client to access the services. Kelley also teaches one subscription system (Page 1 – paragraph [0023], paragraph [0026], [paragraph [0027], Page 10 – paragraph [0104], Figure 15 and Figure 18); including an address server (Page 1 – paragraph [0014], Figure 6 – Content Server, Page 3 – paragraph [0045] lines 1-4); for allowing said client to



subscribe to said at least one service provider (Page 2 – paragraph [0038] lines 11-20, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18); upon reception of said address the client accesses said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider (Page 2 – paragraph [0033], Page 4 – paragraph [0050] lines 21-24, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18); upon detection of the subscription of the client said at least one subscription system and subscribes to said at least one service provider ; (Page 3 – paragraph [0043] lines 1-3, Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 1-18, paragraph [0059] lines 8-16. Here, once the users registers for the subscription services, the user is authenticated to use the services of the service provider).

58. Weinstein and Kelley have common grounds of client server communication in accessing and exchanging data resources. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Kelley with Weinstein by implementing a subscription system where clients can be authenticated to access services from a service provider by means of an encryption key in order to maintain security and unique identification.

59. Weinstein and Kelley teach the limitations of Claim 12 as stated above. Kelley also teaches detection of the subscription of the client, said at least one

subscription system transfers to the client. (Page 5 – paragraph [0057] lines 18-29).

60. However, Weinstein and Kelley do not explicitly state about when software and predetermined access control protocol are not compatible, the method comprises the following elements: an authentication for accessing services to which the client has subscribed; and information which makes it possible to make the software of the client compatible with the predetermined access control protocol.
61. Conversely, Grobman teaches the above limitations. Grobman teaches a system for authenticating a outside client to access the services of a system. Grobman also teaches authenticating a client to access services when software and predetermined access control protocol are not compatible. (Page 1, paragraph [0013], Page 2 – paragraph [0019]. Here the application operates to convert or transcode between authentication systems in order to allow a new incompatible protocol and forward he credentials in order to be authenticated. The application may alter or change the credentials before forwarding them according to the new incompatible protocol, which makes it possible to make the software of the client compatible with the access control protocol).
62. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols and software compatibility. It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Grobman with Weinstein by implementing a system where the client with incompatible protocol is authenticated internally after verifying security credentials even before accessing the external system.

63. With respect to Claim 15, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman teach the limitations of Claim 1 as described above. However, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman do not explicitly state wherein the method comprises authenticating the client to the services of plural service providers via plural virtual networks and comprises if the software of the client and predetermined access control protocol are not compatible, authorizing data transfer between the client and plural subscription systems for subscribing the client to plural service providers via the authentication network that allows the client to access the services of each service provider.
64. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such a limitation. Prasad teaches a method for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches the method which authenticates the client to the services of plural service providers via plural virtual networks (Figure 2A blocks 2-001 through 2-004, Column 8, lines 1-23. Here the client is authenticated upon successful verification); wherein if the software of the client is not compatible with the

predetermined access control protocol, authorizing data transfer between the client and plural subscription systems for subscribing the client to plural service providers via the authentication network which allows the client to access the services of each service provider. (Column 2, lines 35-54. Column 18, lines 36-42. Figure 5B. Figure 7 - ISP 726. Here, when the subscription of the client is modified, the client is not compatible with the network and data is transferred to the client by the authenticated network).

65. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.
66. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman by implementing an improved service selection and management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.
67. With respect to Claim 16, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman teach the limitations of Claim 11 as described above. However, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman do not explicitly state the limitations as stated in Claim 16.
68. Conversely Prasad does in fact teach such limitations. Prasad teaches a method for modifying a subscription of a subscriber to a telecommunication service in a

communication network with access protocols, authenticating and authorizing users to access resources via a communication network. Prasad also teaches wherein the system is arranged for accessing plural virtual networks for allowing the client to access plural service providers and each virtual network is set up on the telecommunication network, (Prasad - Figure 2A, blocks 2-008 through 2-011, Figure 2B, blocks 2-012 through 2-014); wherein: the subscription system is arranged to subscribe (Prasad - Figure 5B. Here the user credentials are verified in order to access subscription systems); plural service providers via the network, (Prasad - Figure 2A blocks 2-001 through 2-004, Column 8, lines 1-23. Here the client who has subscribed to access service providers are authenticated upon successful verification of their credentials) and is arranged to transfer to the client at least one authentication for accessing the plural service providers if the client subscribes to plural service providers. (Prasad - Column 5, lines 59-67, Column 6, lines 1-2. Figure 1, Block 114. Here the non compatible client is authenticated to use the services of the service provider).

69. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Prasad also teaches client server communication with access protocols and accessing and sharing resources.

70. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Prasad with Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman by implementing an improved service selection and

management system which provides authentication functions to users regardless of any service they subscribe to.

71. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman in further view of Addington et al. (US 7,194,756).

72. With respect to Claim 10, Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman teach the limitations of Claim 1 as described above. However Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman do not explicitly state about teaching a method according to Claim 1, wherein the telecommunication network is a high-speed network based on Ethernet technology, and wherein the predetermined access control protocol is a protocol of the IEEE 802.1x type, and the clients are connected to the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer via connections of the DSL type.

73. Conversely, Addington teaches such a limitation where the telecommunication network which he uses is a high speed network based on Ethernet technology, (Column 55, lines 61-67) and the predetermined access control protocol is a protocol of the IEEE 802.11b (Column 56, lines 1-4 and Figure 22, block 1556).

74. Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman have common grounds of client server communication, accessing and exchanging data resources involving access protocols with software compatibility. Addington teaches digital communication

network involving subscription services using IP Protocol. All references teach communication networks using IP Protocols.

75. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Addington with Weinstein, Kelley and Grobman in order to have high speed wireless data access from the network to the user's computer. (Addington's teachings on Column 55, lines 61-67 and Column 56, lines 1-4).

76. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad in view of Addington.

77. With respect to Claim 13, Prasad teaches a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor which allows at least one client to access the services of at least one service provider, (Prasad's teachings on Figure 4A, block 4-001 through 4-004); the client line multiplexor being arranged for relaying information transmitted by the at least one client and associated with authentication of the at least one client to an authentication server, (Prasad's teachings on Figure 2B, block 2-017, Figure 4A, blocks 4-004 and 4-005. Here the information of the client is relayed to the authentication server)

78. Prasad teaches the limitations of Claim 13 as described above. However Prasad does not explicitly state about the digital subscriber line access multiplexor including a software module according to the IEEE 802.1x standard.

79. Conversely, Addington teaches such a limitation in his telecommunication network which uses a high speed network based on Ethernet technology (Addington's teachings on Column 55, lines 61-67) and the client line multiplexor includes a software module (Column 30, lines 5-6) according to the protocol which is IEEE 802.11b.
80. Addington teaches digital communication network involving subscription services using IP Protocol. Prasad also teaches a telecommunications network involving subscription services using IP Protocol. Both references teach communication networks using IP Protocols. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Addington with Prasad in order to have enhanced services such as Personal Video Recording (PVR) from the service provider and configuring the service in the host. (Addington's teachings on Column 30, lines 5-10).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2443  
1/19/2012

/PHUOC NGUYEN/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit  
2443